

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9
10 STEVEN BONILLA,

No. C-02-0636 MHP

11 Plaintiff,

ORDER

12 v.

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et. al.,

14 Defendants.

15 /

16
17 Plaintiff is an inmate under sentence of death at San Quentin State Prison. He was convicted
18 of first degree murder and sentenced to death in Alameda County Superior Court on January 20,
19 1995.

20 Plaintiff filed a *pro se* action in this court on February 6, 2002. After his complaint was
21 dismissed with leave to amend, he filed an amended complaint in 2002 and a second amended
22 complaint in 2005. Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, plaintiff sought to compel the
23 government to disclose a number of documents.

24 Pursuant to court orders in 2007, defendant United States produced a number of documents.
25 At that time, plaintiff was represented by counsel David Nickerson. In November 2007, plaintiff
26 and defendant stipulated that the case should be dismissed, agreeing that the United States had fully
27 complied with the court's orders. Per an order dated November 26, 2007, this court dismissed
28 plaintiff's action pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The court stated
in its order that "[a]bsent showing of good cause, no further requests for relief will be entertained in

1 this matter."

2 Despite the fact that this case is closed, plaintiff has filed a number of subsequent motions,
3 all of which this court has denied. Most recently, plaintiff filed three separate pleadings. On
4 November 18, 2010, he filed a "Letter of Request"; on November 22, 2010, he filed a pleading
5 entitled "Damage Control Caused by the Conspiracy to Obstruct Justice"; and on November 23,
6 2010, he filed a pleading "Requesting Ruling on Court Order Obtained Under False Pretenses."

7 The dismissal order in this case confirmed that only a showing of good cause would justify
8 further requests for relief from plaintiff. Having reviewed plaintiff's pleadings, the court finds that
9 there is no adequate showing of good cause for plaintiff's requests and motions. Thus, all of
10 plaintiff's requests and motions contained in his pleadings of November 18, 22 and 23, 2010 are
11 DENIED with prejudice and this case remains closed.

12
13
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15
16 DATED: December 8, 2010

17
18 
Marilyn Hall Patel
United States District Judge